Beginning of

A critical evaluation of the contributions of Professor Benjamin W. Bacon to the interpretation of the fourth gospel

This title was preceded by

The Jesus of history reinterpreted for today

And is continued by

Predestination and incarnation

The social and religious origins of the Negro Church

The contribution of the new physics to religious thought

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1935 call number Thesis Cage 1935 v.4

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/criticalevaluati00unse

A Critical Evaluation of the Contributions of Professor Benjamin W. Bacon to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel

By

Bertha E. Pease

A.B. College of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington, 1931

M.A. Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, California, 1932

Thesis
submitted in the Department of
New Testament
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

in

Pacific School of Religion

1935

C O N T E N T S

* * *

		Page
I	Introduction	1
	1. The Man	1
II	Authorship and Date	5
	1. External Evidence	7
	The Testimony of the Early Church Fathers	
	2. Internal Evidence	22
	Direct Internal Evidence	22
	The Discourses. The Chronology of Jesus' Career. The Appendix.	
	Indirect Internal Evidence	27
	3. The Date of Writing	31
III	The Incarnation of the Divine Logos as a Development of Pauline Christology	33
	1. Hellenistic Christology	34
	2. The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics	45
	3. Literary Criticism	51
IV	Conclusion	
	1. Contributions Peculiar to Bacon	56
	A. Authorship. Gospel of the Hellenists. From the Same Hand as the Epistles. Final Identity of theAuthor.	56
	B. Development of Pauline Christology . . .	59
	C. Other Contributions	60
	The Son of Man. Salvation. Concerning Labor of John the Baptist.	
	2. Other Scholar's Opinions of Bacon's Contributions	61
	3. My Own Conclusions	67

Preface .

In this thesis I have sometimes referred to the Fourth Gospel as John's Gospel as it is called in the English Translations and as we have used it tradtitionally. In some of the discussions I have also used the name John when referring to the author of the book as did also Bacon when speaking of the traditional questions.

The writer of the Gospel is sometimes spoken of as the Elder, John, of Ephesus, meaning merely some elder whose name happened to be John, not the apostle. Sometimes he is spoken of as the Ephesian Elder, sometimes just the Elder, again, as the Evangelist, again, as the Writer of the Fourth Gospel. In this I have followed the example of Professor Bacon but since there are so many names for the character, this explanation is give. The Redactor and the witness are not identical with the Evangelist as I think is made clear enough within the document. The Redactor and the editor in this case are the same.

A Critical Evaluation of the Contributions of Professor Benjamin W. Bacon to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel

Introduction

The Man

Benjamin Wisner Bacon, Litt. D., D.D.,LL.D. graduated from Yale University in 1881 and three years later from Yale Divinity School. He received a unanimous call to the First Congregational Church at Lyme Ct. during his last year in the school. He accepted this Church, married Miss Eliza Buckingham Aiken, who graced the parsonage home, and together they served the pastorate twelve years. At the end of this period, Professor Bacon was called to his Alma Mater to succeed Professor Timothy Dwight the younger, in the Chair of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis.

He entered Yale just at a time when Higher Criticism was coming to the foreground in America. He was a progressive scholar and came from a family of liberal background as was exemplified in his grandfather, Leonard Bacon, who was fifty-seven years pastor at First (Center) Church in New Haven and who also served as a member of the Divinity faculty. His four sons followed the same calling. The oldest of these four was Leonard Woolsey Bacon, father of Benjamin Wisner Bacon.

It was as a champion of higher criticism that Professor Benjamin W. Bacon made his greatest contribution to the

development of theology as he himself testifies,[1] in securing for the methods and results of higher criticism their rightful place.

Yale had been served by Professors before his time which he characterizes as victims of "an occupational disease all too prevalent among University Professors, more especially in their declining years, which I shall designate "senile, or academic, paralysis of the judgment." He referred thus particularly to Professor Gibbs of whom one of Gibbs' associate Professors (Dr. Taylor) said,"I would rather have ten settled opinions, and nine of them wrong, than to be like my brother Gibbs, with none of the ten settled."

Others there were also who would scarcely "pronounce categorically on either side."In illustration of the way in which Professors before him had consistently replied to students who presented question, difficult of exegesis without use of the higher criticism, Professor Bacon presents as authentic the following:

Mr. B.: This etymology(of Gen. 4:1) is based on a Hebrew root.Did they speak Hebrew in the garden of Eden?

Prof. D. (triumphantly): If they did not speak Hebrew,

---

1 Fern, Virgilius, Contemporary American Theology, p. 1

what did they speak?[1]

Some such answer as the above or the favorite expression of one of them "Now let us hang that up for consideration," left many questions hanging in thin air as it were.

It became at once then, both the task and the high privilege of Professor Bacon to break this "ostrich 'peace' sought in the suppression policy"[2] and to become the great exponent of higher criticism who defended the Scriptures against the"tradition of the Scribes" and sought to give a truly historical and unbiased account of the origin of Christian archives.

Even though Professor Bacon advocated and was himself a leader in the breaking down of old traditions and the establishment of higher criticism, and even though he had never earned a Ph. D. he held the chair of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University from the year 1896 to the year 1928. He was Professor Emeritus thereafter until his death on Feb. 1, 1932. He was one of the foremost American scholars in the field of New Testament studies. Therefore the contributions which he has made to the study of the Fourth Gospel are most worthy of thoughtful investigation.

In 1900 his book An Introduction to the New Testament was published. This was the first American work ofthe kind. The Macmillan Company asked him to prepare it fortheir series of

---

1 Ibid., p. 14

2 Ibid., p. 16

New Testament Handbooks. The fifth division of that book deals with the Johannine writings. In four issuesof the Hibbert Journal: April, 1903; I:3; January, 1904, II: 2; January, 1905, III: 2 and October, 1907, VI: 1 appear technical discussions of the Johannine Problem, dealing specifically with the origin ofthe Fourth Gospel.

In 1910 was published his bookThe Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, which grew out of the above mentioned articles. This is perhaps the weightiest contribution which has been made to the problem. In this as in other treatments of the Johannine Problem, Professor Bacon took his stand sharply against the conclusions of such scholars as Lightfoot, Sanday, and James Drummond who had not given up the traditional view that John the Apostle wrote the Fourth Gospel. He has standing with him, however, such scholars as E. F. Scott, B. H. Streeter, S.J. Case, James Moffatt and others who are assured that the Apostle John did not write the Fourth Gospel.

We may have lost some of Professor Bacon's argument for the Fourth Gospel as "The Gospel of the Hellenists" in his latest treatment of this Problem,which bears that title,for it was not published until after his death and had to be corrected without his supervision.

The purpose of this thesis is to present and evaluate the contributions which Professor Bacon has made to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.

---

1 See also The Expositor (1907), The Journal of Biblical Literature (1894, 1908) and the American Journal of Theology (1900)

II Authorship and Date

Any true interpretation of a document must be made in the light of the time and circumstances in which it was written. It is expedient therefore that we know who wrote the Fourth Gospel and when it was written in order that we may interpret the message which it contains. If it were written by John, the son of Zebedee, one of the twelve, indeed, the "beloved disciple", we would quite naturally regard the incidents recorded there and the words which Jesus spoke according to this Gospel, as more accurate than the records of the Synoptists. Surely one who lived so intimately with Jesus would be able more accurately to interpret his actions and his teachings than would one who was more removed from his life both in point of time and relationship. For only one of the Synoptic writers was a disciple and perhaps we have only fragmentary portions of his original writings. Thus the weight of evidence would rest with John's Gospel and all of New Testament Criticism and the entire Christian doctrine would suffer change, because ofthe marked differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. However,we cannot prove that it was written by John, the son of Zebedee, one of the twelve.

If, on the other hand, it were written by a Christian who had been deeply affected by Hellenistic civilization, schooled in Phrygo-Alexandrian mysticism, and written out of Palestine some seventy or seventy-five years after the death of Jesus, we can readily see how another philosophy than that which Jesus held would be contained therein. We can understand how the life of Jesus would be interpreted in the light of the Christian experience of the writer and the writer's contemporaries, and in the light of their theology which came to them as a development from Paul's teaching of the indwelling Christ ever present with them.

It is as though the Church in Ephesus answered Paul's prayer of Ephesians 3:14-19:[1]

> For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be stengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; to the end that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God.

In Professor Bacon's treatment of the Johannine problem he endeavors to discover the true author and date by dealing in the first place with the external evidence and in the second place with the internal evidence. This latter he divides into

---

1 Bacon, B.W., An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 251

two parts :

1. The Direct Internal Evidence

2. The Indirect Internal Evidence

This paper will consider his treatment of the Problem under the same topics and in the same order.

1. External Evidence

There are two types of external evidence that a writing exists, both of which are shown by the way other authors use it. One is the unacknowledged type which uses the special ideas, language, or phraseology but does not give the source. The other is the acknowledged type where direct quotations are made and the books or writings referred to are mentioned by name until they come to be looked upon as possessing peculiar authority. In the New Testament field this authority is usually defended by tracing it to an apostolic origin.

Obviously, such evidence does not prove authorship except as it proves the date of the writing and thus eliminates authors who at another date would be possible. Then this is true only when the actual literary dependence can be shown and when the evidence of the priority of the one document over the other is not ambiguous.

The Testimony of the Early Church Fathers

We find among the early church fathers a great deal of

similarity in ideas within their writings and within the Fourth Gospel. We also find quotations occasionally made directly from the Gospel. Thus we have both the acknowledged and unacknowledged external evidence.

In his article, The Johannine Problem, (Hibbert Journal Vol. I, pp. 509-31) Professor Bacon refers to the conclusion of von der Goltz' analysis of the Logos doctrine of Ignatius and Justin in comparison with the Johannine in which he makes clear that while Justin shows more probable traces of acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel, Ignatius who shows no knowledge of it is most like it in the nature of his doctrine. This similarity in doctrine regardless of acquaintanceship with each other's work shows that the matter of external evidence is not merely a question of the existence or the non-existence of the Fourth Gospel but of the existence of a great mass of doctrine and tradition, Gnostic and Orthodox out of which the Gospel comes to take its place as an authority appealed to on both sides as Johannine.

We cannot say that the silence of Eusebius and that of his authorities is favorable to apostolic authorship for an argument from silence is always questionable; yet, surely, if a work had emerged by 100 A.D. which was regarded as apostolic, it would have possessed for Papias and Justin and others of

the church fathers a high degree of importance rather than receiving mere casual reference.

Professor Bacon's method of procedure for determing the external evidence as to authorship is to set a limit at 170 A.D. and going back of that line to make a two-fold inquiry:

(1) What difference is there in the use made of the Johannine material as we go back?

(2) What becomes of the tradition of John as an author?

1. The arguments from silence are the silence of Eusebius, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, Ignatius and, differing in this last from other scholars, Bacon adds the silence of Papias.

Direct ascription to the apostle John of the Fourth Gospel begins with Theophilus of Antioch (181 A.D.) who cited the Gospel by name, quoting John 1:1 as from "John, one of those who were vessels of the Spirit."[2] Before this the Gopel had been used by the 'heathen' philosopher, Celsus (c.178), it had been included in the Diatesseron of Tatian, the Sinaitic Syriac version of about the same date. So that in the last quarter of the second century the Fourth Gospel was firmly rooted in every branch of the Christian Church except that of the Alogi, who appear to have been orthodox Asiatic opponents of Montanism, conservative as contrasted to its

---

1 The Hibbert Journal, "The Johannine Problem," Vol.I, p. 525

2 Bacon, B.W. An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 30

excesses, ultra-conservative, so Irenaeus and his school thought, in resisting the doctrine of a four-fold gospel.

2. We have yet to inquire as to what became of the tradition of John as the author. So far as the evidence shows, all that connects him with the Fourth Gospel are legends of the Gnostics. The only gleam of light that Professor Bacon [illegible] groups John with Matthew in his list of the apostles. However since Papias uses Revelation to support his interpretations of Matthew and Mark he may easily have had John, the seer of Revelation, in mind. For the rest the silence regarding the apostle John becomes more pronounced as we come nearer to the time of the original.[1]

The external evidence as to the early existence (90-110) of the Fourth Gospel is conclusively determined and has been since Schürer and Sanday (c.1891). Recent scholarship has merely added emphasis to this conclusion. The question which we have left to us is: What kind of existence did it have in the firsthalf of the second century? Did it circulate in its present form with the so-called appendix or letter of commendation? Was I John attached or did it circulate with neither chapter 21 or the First Epistle?

The Johannine type of teaching appears to have been

---

[1] Op. Cit. Hibbert Journal, pp. 526-28

known in Asia Minor and Northern Syria as early as 115 A.D. as attested by the resemblance between the Fourth Gospel and the Ignatian letters. In the period immediately following 115 acquaintance with Johannine literature is attested also through references by Polycarp, who quotes a phrase from the Epistles; by Papias who, according to Eusebius, was familiar with the First Epistle and is sometimes said to have known the Gospel. (The argument here is that Papias was a channel through whom Irenaeus received the testimony of the elders to the logion "in the things of my Father are many mansions.")

As the conviction grows that the X Literature (see footnote) [1] was known in some form in Northern Syria and Asia Minor by 115 A. D. it becomes more difficult to conceive that the Apostle John was the author or that it was even ascribed to him originally. If it were of Apostolic authorship, the meagre use of it made before Tatian and its apparent lack of authority are inexplicable. Both Papias and Justin appealed to the authority of John, the Apostle, for their millenarian doctrine based on the book of Revelation. Hence we would expect them to appeal to the same authority for the Logos Doctrine had they believed that John the Apostle was its author. But it was 186 A.D., the time of the Muratorianum and Irenaeus be-

---

1 This is the title which Professor Bacon gave to the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles which bear the name of "John" in order, as he said, "to avoid prejudgment of the case."

fore the Fourth Gospel was able to gain authority and canonical standing. Then it was accomplished only through bitter conservative resistance.

We have indirect evidence for the Apostle John's authorship appearing earlier than any evidence thus far mentioned. It is found in the views which Marcion opposed about 140 A.D. Tertullian accuses this "arch-heretic" of "striving to destroy the standing of those gospels (Mt & Jn) which are ascribed specifically to apostles "and of favoring secondary witnesses (Mk & Lk). His comments would not be justified by mere neglect on Marcion's part, therefore we must conclude that he had said something in disparagement of the claim of apostolic authorship for John. The claim then, must have been known as early as 140 A.D. in Rome. It seems that Justin did not support it either since he failed to secure a copy of the Fourth Gospel for himself.

The weight of evidence for the traditional view that the Apostle John wrote the Gospel hangs on chapter 21. It has been declared that there is no external evidence that the Fourth Gospel ever existed without this appendix(ch.21). Yet this can hardly be true for the longer ending of Mark (16:9-20) which was composed about 150 A.D. begins its enumeration of the resurrection experiences with a reference

to John 20:1-18 and continues with references to Matthew and Luke but does not mention John 21. This is again an argument from silence and therefore a weak one, but when the twenty-first chapter would offer data so well adapted to the purposes of this epitomater who wrote Mark 16:9-20 and when he has referred to John 20 it would appear that unless the Fourth Gospel had at that time existed without chapter 21, he would have used it.

Professor Bacon contends that this chapter which he styles an appendix was added in order to suggest in a guarded way that the writer of the Gospel was one of the twelve disciples. Thus having concluded that it was an appendix, he has removed a great obstacle forhis thesis that the Apostle John did not write the book.

We have next to deal with the Origin of the Tradition of John at Ehpesus where the aged apostle according to that theory is supposed to have written the Fourth Gospel. Professor Bacon deals with the several steps involved in tracing the origin of this tradition.

Papias holds that John met a martyr's death in Jerusalem at the time of the disturbances of the Jewish war and at the same time believes that he was on the isle of Patmos for his prophetic vision and activity. His prophetic activity came

according to this tradition (which investigation proves to be false)

at "the time of the Emperor Claudius"; as assigned by Epiphanius, (and the same chronology is supposed by Chrysostom and the Muratorianum). It is assumed that at the dispersion of the twelve from Jerusalem, by the persecution of Herod Agrippa which took place in the second year of Claudius' reign, twelve years after the crucifixion, that John the Apostle, due to the fate of his brother who had already suffered a martyr's death, took refuge on the isle of Patmos. He is said to have returned to Jerusalem after Herod's death in 44 A.D. There would be no conflict between the date of his prophecy and his martyrdom if this explanation could be accepted; but the prophecy fits the conditions of Asia under Domitian, not under Claudius. As seen by the early Christians, who knew nothing of higher criticism, it was as natural that John should prophecy under Claudius that which would take place in the reign of Domitian as it was for Isaiah to prophecy at the time of Hezekiah that which would take place during the Babylonian captivity and even later. Hence Papias not being a modern scholar, found no conflict between the Apostolic origin of Revelation and the early martyrdom of John.

For us however, the fact that John met his death no later than 70 A. D. and perhaps as early as 62 A. D.[1] is proof that he could not have been the writer of Revelation

---

1 Bacon, B. W. The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, p. 142 f.

whose internal evidence shows that it must have been written not earlier than 95 A.D.

The date, 62 A.D., mentioned above refers to the tradition regarding the death of James. Professor Bacon tries to read John's martyrdom into this tradition in the story of Hegesippus, in which he feels that the part of James is overloaded. But I should not even consider this as evidence, for on the face of it, it is pure conjecture.[1] I believe that Professor Bacon manifests a weakness in his scholarship in showing this tendency to make an assumption and then proceed to argue on the basis of that assumption. When on e discovers this, the force of all his arguments is weakened, for one immediately looks for and questions the basic assumption. It is like the Hindu method of reasoning by drawing a vivid analogy and then proceeding as though because the analogy were made it necessarily follows that the point in question has been proved: e.g. because there is potential butter in all cream does not prove that Brahma is in Atman.[2] Neither does the overlaoding of Jmaes part in the narrative of Hegesippus prove that John also was a party in the martyrdom described there. However, Professor Bacon points to more conclusive evidence of the martyrdom of John: Clement of Alexandria asserted that the

---

1 Bacon, B.W. The Gospel of the Hellenists, pp 28ff.

2 See Upanishad Svetasvatara

period of Apostolic teaching ended in the reign of Nero. If his words do not actually refer to the death of all the apostles before 70 A.D. at least they scarcely leave room for the assumption that John continued as the Church's great witness and defender of the faith throughout the reign of Vespasian, Titus and Domitian.

There is also the evidence which DeBoor discovered from Papias in 1888, for the contention that John was killed by the Jews, thus fulfilling with his brother the words of Jesus:"My cup indeed ye shall drink." (Mt. 20:23)

The question then arises: If John's early martrydom makes his authorship of the Apocalypse impossible, how did his name come to associated with the book?

In the first place both tradition and internal evidence point to Ephesus as the place in which the book was written and we have explicit testimony from Irenaeus and Polycrates that Polycarp and other"Ephesian worthies" held intercourse with the apostle. Irenaeus said,"John, the disciple of the Lord, who also reclined on his bosom, published his Gospel while staying at Ephesus in Asia."[1] This lends support to both parts of the tradition that he was in Ephesus and that he wrote the Fourth Gospel there. But as to the Apocalypse

---

1
Bacon, B.W., The Gospel of the Hellenists, p 49, [illegible]

2
_____, An Introduction to the New Testament, p 48
See also Hermas 3:1,1 & 3:11, 1

the book itself says that its message came from God to his servant "John" and the address the seven churches is ascribed to"John." Since the book came from Ephesus and John had gone to Ehpesus and the book was ascribed to a John, naturally it came to be accepted as from the hand of the apostle. Later, when the question of authorship arose, it was suggested that there may have been a distinguished elder of Ephesus named John who could have written the book. This question perhaps begun by Eusebius because of his prejudice against the doctrines of Revelation has been widely studied in more modern times.

Professor Bacon offers the conjecture that one of the daughters of Philip wrote the Apocalypse, editing it under John's name. Tradition undeniably indicates that Philip came with four "prophesying"daughters from Caesarea in Palestine to live in Asia Minor and that he settled in Ephesus. One of his daughters, knowing well the apostle John who had come from Samaria to Jerusalem to assist her father Philip in his resistance to the false prophecy of Simon Magus; put together ancient prophecies of the fate of Jerusalem and similar prophecies which she had brought with her from Palestine and which she considered truly expressed the mind of the martyred apostle, and edited them under his name.

By way of substantiating his conjecture Professor Bacon refers to Charles' statement that the language of the book indicates a Palestinian refugee as author. Though this is only a conjecture it is possible for Philip and John were closely associated and the daughter had the opportunity to know John well and to be aware of his influence. To give one's writing the name of an apostle or prophet was not at all contrary to the method of apocalyptic "prophecy", either Jewish or Christian. I,also, must admit that some of the visions of Revelation sound more like those of a woman given to such experiences than those of a man given to seeing visions though such reasoning is subjective, and therefore counts nothing in the way of evidence. Nevertheless, whether this hypothesis or some other answers the question:Who wrote Revelation? we conclude that having been written in 95 A.D. it could not have been written by the Apostle John, martyred in or before 70 A.D.

Professor Bacon suggests that while tradition it seems places the aged apostle John in Ephesus [illegible] of the misinterpretation of the claim of Revelation to have been written by John, it is only the common device of pseudonymity. To show that this tradition is literary in origin, we look into the life of John the apostle as far as we have any record. The last statement made about John in Acts is that he went to

Samaria with Peter as a representative from the Apostolic Church at Jerusalem to aid the work which Philip had started and to oppose the work of Simon Magus. Paul refers to him along with Peter and James as a"pillar"of the church. In their conference with Paul,John was willing that Paul should go to the Gentiles but as for himself and the others, they would confine themselves to"the circumcision." Throughout the synoptic Gospels and Acts what few references we have concerning the Apostle John, lead one to believe that he was a conservative Jewish Christian. The failure of earlier writers to mention the presence of the Apostle in Asia leads one to believe that the meagre references of the first part of the second century, some of which have been mentioned, come to us as an attempt to prove authorityfor the Scripture rather than as historical data.

We have no evidence that the Apostle John ever wavered from his position as a "pillar" and it is likely that after the death of Peter and Paul and the disappearance of other disciples from Jerusalem that he carried on together with James the Lord's brother as a representative of the Mother-Church until their martyrdom.[2] At least there is as much evidence to substantiate this view as that he was found as an old man in Ephesus.

---

[1] See Gal. 2:9

[2] Bacon, B.W., The Gospel of the Hellenists,p.26ff.

Another evidence agianst accrediting the Fourth Gospel to John, the Apostle is the vast difference in personality between John,the elder,and John,the disciple of the Synoptics. Of this Professor Bacon made a good deal. He said, concerning those who make the Ephesian Gospel to come from the hand of John the Apostle,"From an unlettered Galilean fisherman John has become a cultured citizen of Jerusalem, well able to discuss the problems of Jewish rabbinic lore or Hellinistic theosophy with the followers of the schools. Nay, he is a familiar visitor at the high priest's palace, having the entrée for himself and his friends. From a place of comparative obscurity he has risen to become the favored disciple of thewhole group, specially "beloved"by Jesus, able beyond all others to read the Master's thoughts, and the first to lay hold of the resurrection faith. From a silent follower of Peter, and later of James, John has become a leader of Hellenistic Christianity. No longer one of those who leave to Paul missions among the Gentiles, reserving to themselves only "the Circumcision,"John has become a Paulinizing universalist. From an apocalyptist of deepest dye he has become a mystic, underming the very foundations of apocalyptic by a doctrine of the indwelling Life." [1]

Professor Bacon points out further that the man addressed by Jesus as Boanerges, meaning 'son of thunder' and by a closer translation of the Aramaic 'son of wrath' is not the idealized John of the later centuries. This last statement I believe is another of Professor Bacon's assumptions which would not stand alone as proof that the Apostle John did not write the Fourth Gospel; for it is common knowledge in the light of human psychology that impetuous youths may become very mellowed as old men, may even become mystics.

---

1 Ibid.,p. 31

Professor Bacon believes that a Jewish elder, John of Ephesus wrote the Fourth Gospel. He describes him thus:

> He is a fromidable oppent of Gnostic heresy, overwhelming the Docetists of the Cerinthian type with authority and invective. In the Church he is a leader of such eminence that he dispatches delegates to various churches, and, when these are mot received, threatens condign punishment upon the recalcitrant parish. He especially delights to speak of himself as representing the body of historic witnesses of the incarnation. In his Gospel he presents an account of the words and works Of Jesus amazingly independent of the Synoptic tradition, and prefaced with a hymn replete with speculative allusions. He is a Jew by birth, a master of the idiom employed in religious dispute, a man of culture, familiar with Jerusalem and its rabbinic lore** in short, a very formidable champion of orthodoz Christianity at Ephesus in its conflict with a multitude of hostile forces. [1] ----------this great Christian who struggled to deliver the Gospel from the maelstrom of syncretistic theosophy which threatened to engulf it at Ephesus, and who in his writings sought to reawaken the faithful to an understanding of the spiritual content and the historic associations of their own particular Christian heritage.[2]

We have then,in this Gospel, the teachings of Jesus presented by a mind which looks back over the church's conflict from 50-100 A.D. with Hellenistic theosophy and Gnostic philosophy. Consequently he speaks with great assurance as being the personal "possessor of a revelation which reaches the end of religion by attaining fellowship with God."[3]

---

1 Ibid., pp.48-49

2 Ibid., pp50-51

3 Bacon, B.W., An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 256

2. Internal Evidence

There is abundant evidence within the Gospel itself that it was written by a Hellenist and not by one of the twelve intimate disciples.

Direct Internal Evidence

The Discourses

The ancient historian assumed the right to place in the mouths of his characters ideas of his own which he deemed suitable to the occasion. Almost no one will deny that in the Fourth Gospel this prerogative has been used to the limit. He reports the private conversations of Jesus with Pilate, with Nicodemus, with the woman of Samaria; and it is difficult to tell where the words of Jesus as speaker leave off and the interpretation of his teaching by the evangelist begins.

The discourses are of a uniform type: The bread of life, the water of life, "I am the good shepherd," "I am the door," "I am the true vine," "I am the way," and "I am the light of the world." This is not Jesus' characteristic way of teaching according to the more historical Synoptics.

The Synoptics give Jesus' teaching as they would naturally be adapted to the historical circumstances. They begin with a close following of the reform message of John the Baptist, and proceed with the teaching of Jesus as to the nature of the Kingdom, an explanation of what it means to be righteous,

a teaching of the breadth of God's love as a father; and thus gradually he appreaches the announcement of his Messiahship.

The Johannine discourses know no such development. The form is frequently obscure, controversial and unsympathetic. Jesus announces his Messiahship from the outset and the discussions which follow scarcely fit the Galilean synagogues or the streets of Jerusalem. They show a much closer relation to the school of Tyrannus in Ephesus where Paul was [illegible] for two years. Perhaps some student of his having reasoned against an opponent on the higher Christology which Paul taught went on to develop yet further his teaching.

The feasts are used as settings for the discourses: at the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Christ is presented as the true manna, at the Feast of Dedication, known as the Feast of Lights also, Jesus presents himself as the Light of the World, etc.

Professor Bacon does not deny that the genuine words of Jesus are embedded in these discourses, for as he points out, it would be strange if the writer did not use them but we cannot regard the discourses as a whole in any way other than a Johannine elaboration.[1]

The Chronology of Jesus' Career

The outline of Jesus career is given in a manner that is not only out of harmony with the tradition of the other three,

---

[1] Ibid., p 260 f.

but cannot be reconciled with the historical situation. This is illustrated in the approach of Jesus to the final tragedy. His time of witnessing is treated as a mere interval to be passed over until the time of his glorification and his death as atonement is anticipated from the beginning. This author even puts the Pauline doctrine into the mouth of John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." One has but to compare these passages in John1:29,36 with Luke3:7-9, 16f., & 7:18f.,23 to see the difference.

The transposing of the cleansing of the Temple which, clearly comes at the close of Jesus' earthly life when he is ready to openly declare his purpose before the religious authorities, to a place at the beginning of his ministry, surely cannot be true to history.

The Appendix

Those who hold that the Apostle John wrote the Fourth Gospel manifest by their praseology that their evidence rests upon chapter 21. Within the rest of the Gospel the figure of "the beloved disciple" is veiled but in chapter 21 the veil is lifted. The sons of Zebedee are plainly introduced. The twenty-fourth verse openly declares: "This is the disciple that beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things." Following Professor Bacon's argument, we start with the assumption that chapter 21 is an appendix added to the Gospel

by the Redactor for the purpose of gaining Apostolic authority.

Quite common is the argument that since we have no mss of John which lack the appendix, the Gospel never circulated without it. But since in all the evidence before 140 A.D. we find no claim for apostolic authorship and yet we find acquaintance with the contents of the Gospel and the Epistles which in the New Testament bear John's name, the natural inference is that chapter 21 which then appears unknown is an appendix which was added later. The evidence of 140 A.D. was indirect and doubtful. In fact 170 A.D. is the usual date given for the suggestion that John the Apostle wrote the Fourth Gospel.

There is internal evidence in the appendix which agrees with the apparent ignorance of the early writers of its claim. The similarity of the style and language is not so great as to prohibit the possibility of simple imitation plus a revision of the Gospel proper by a redactor. On the contrary, there are marked differences both in style and doctrinal conception which have been pointed out as Professor Bacon states from Scholten to Schmiedel. Outstanding among these differences are:

1. The appendix returns to the Synoptic concept of the resurrection where Jesus is raised (ἐγείρεσθαι) not risen (ἀνίστημι) from the dead.[1]

2. As to the treatment of the Second Coming: Cf. 21:23 with 14:22-23 noting how in the Gospel proper we have the indwelling Christ while in the appendix we have the apocalyptic view of

---

[1] Hibbert Journal Vol. II, p.345

the end expressed.

3. Difference of authorship is shown in the relation of the Galilean and Jerusalem traditions. "The writer ofch.20 did not stultify his own work by representing the disciples as returning to their occupation on the 'Sea of Tiberius,' ignorant of the Lord's resurrection(21:4), after he had previously relatéd the overcoming of all their doubts and the equipment of them with their great commission (20:22-23). He did not conceive himself to have related but two appearances 'to his disciples,' merely because'he was manifested first to Mary Magdalene.' He did not first forget that Peter was under disgrace, then, recollecting himself, give him his reinstatement at 'the third time that Jesus was manifested to his disciples.' These are additions by one whose conception of events and of doctrine are different, tending to revert toward the Synoptic type."[1]

4. The symmetry of the Gospel proper is destroyed by the Appendix adding an eighth to the seven signs and a fourth to the three manifestations.

5. The adding of the Appendix makes the book close with a grotesque mixture of conceptions.

If we leave such varying conceptions without explanation or if we try to harmonize them, we do an injustice to the true

---

[1] Ibid., p. 345

author, for it appears that he has not grasped the real sense of his own book.

The direct internal evidence of chapter 21 lacks both antiquity and authority said Professor Bacon. The author was conscious of no literary dishonesty as one would be today if he attached another's name to his own writing in order to have it published. His motive is clear--the authority of an apostle was needed to support the Palestinian eschatology in the face of those who denied the resurrection and the judgment. It was also needed to support a Pauline Logos doctrine as over against an ultra-Pauline Docetic dualism, which denied Christ's existence in the flesh.

Indirect Internal Evidence

John 21:24 seems to conceieve of the Gospel which he edits as written in Palestine. This view was adopted by the Muratorianum and is in harmony with the earlier second century authorities, who look upon Palestine as the home of the Apostolic tradition.

The later view which places the writing in Asia, is first championed by Irenaeus, who recognized either from internal evidence or from some authentic tradition that the Johannine literature was written "to refute the error of Cerinthus"[1] and hence is necessarily of Asiatic origin.

---

[1] Cerinthus taught that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph and Mary, that by his holy life and at baptism he arrived at his pure state, that his death was not a mediatorial one and that he would come again and set up an earthly kingdom.

The most obvious data as to the authorship comes from the Epistles. There with no weilding, he is the "elder" (III Jn.1). Professor Bacon said that reference to Gaius as among his "children", would be grotesque in a young man as likewise would the general address "my little children." Yet one must recall that in the Fourth Gospel proper the author has Jesus address his disciples as "Little Children" in his farewell discourse, just before he gives unto them the new commandment. (See John 13:33) Could not a young man. Either Professor Bacon did not check all the data closely enough at this point or he believes those words put into the mouth of Jesus betray the age of the writer and stand as proof that they are not the actual words of Jesus but what John of Ephesus thought he would have said in that last talk with the disciples.

The term "elder" as used in an official sense is implied in the superscription II John 1, III John 1, 5-8 and in the salutations of the Churches, LL John 1:13.

The Epistles also show as to doctrine that they were written explicitly "concerning them that would lead you astray."[1] These heretics held to a Christ who comes by water, through baptism only--not by water and blood through baptism and crucifixion. Beside their denial of Christ

---

[1] See I John 2:26

having come in the flesh, they professed a love and knowledge of God that in practice was divorced from a pure morality and a self-denying service to man. This is the Docetic heresy of Asia referred to above as the error of Cerinthus, which was evidently opposed by Ignatius and referred to by both Polycarp and Papias.

Professor Bacon having already shown that the contents and phraseology of the Epistles reveal the same authorship as the Fourth Gospel feels justified in using them as proof for identifying that author with the elder of Ephesus.

It is argued that a personlity of such sublime writings and such commanding ability, even though not an apostle, could scarcely remain unknown. To such an argument, Professor Bacon is challenged to introduce a venerable old man whom Justin Martyr looked upon as his spiritual father or guide—the one who led him into the Christian way of life. This old man was familiar with Plato and a past master at the Socratic method. Yet with his own knowledge of Greek philosophy, he believed and taught that the Christians possessed a knowledge that the philosopher did not have—a knowledge that "those who appear worthy of God shall never die." This knowledge he held was guaranteed by the revelation of God in Christ. It is Professor Bacon's belief that this one may as well be looked upon as the author of the Epistles and the Fourth Gospel as the son of Zebedee. The

style and conceptions of the Writings fit such an one better than they do a Galilean fisherman. Whoever this elder was, he seems to have been of Jewish birth, as inded, were so many of the early teachers of Christianity. This may be inferred from the slightly Semitic style of his Greek and the designation of unbelievers as Gentiles (III John 7) It would appear from the Gospel that he had visited Jerusalem, Jacob's well and other sacred cites.

Other indirect internal evidences are:

1. The artificial form of the Gospel--the numerical arrangement:The Prologue begins with three propositions; three days are spent with the Baptist; three times Jesus is in Galilee; three times he journeys to Judea; three Passovers and three other feasts fall within his ministry; three mighty works in Judea; three in Galilee; three disclosures of the traitor; three times denied; three times condemned; three times Pilate trys to save him;three words are spoken from the cross; after three days he rises and he appears three times to his disciples. All this points to a literary device.

2. Subjective evidence is used which makes the book an interpretation rather than an historical account of the life of Jesus. Great liberty is shown in the use of discourses for setting forth the authors conception of doctrines. All characters use the

---

1 Bacon, B.W. An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 77, 78.

same style and ideas and these are like the Johannine Epistles.

3. Hellenistic mysticism pervades the Gospel also.

It is not impossible to suppose that the apostle John at the age of ninety might have superintended the editing of the Gospel, but it is quite out of reason that at that age or older he should transform his entire theology. The style and expressions employed throughout the Gospel though interwoven with Palestinian knowledge appear plainly to be those of one trained in Greek refinement and education and not of one born in the country of Palestine. He speaks of the "the Jews" and"their law" as though he were foreign-born, even though a Jew.[1]

A part of the indirect internal evidence that we have yet to consider is the Development of Pauline Christology within the Fourth Gospel. But since this comprises the whole of the second major division of this thesis it will not be treated in this division.

The Date of Writing

The Fourth Gospel contains no statement as to what time or under what circumstances it was written. Some of the statements seem to look back to the events as narrated from over a long period of time, but these could have been written any time after a quarter of a century, we may say, had passed.

---

[1] Bacon, B. W. An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 275

Other points from which we might conclude a date such as the developed theology is equally indefinite. That leaves only one method to pursue. We must trace back through the extant literature of the third and second centuries all quotations from and references to the Fourth Gospel until these cease. The last one ofthese will give the date before which surely the Gospel was written. This method brings the following results: By 180 A.D. the four Gospels were firmly established in the Church. Quotations from the Gospel are found in abundance at that date. A few references are made to the Gospel by 150 A.D. About 130 A.D. there are some traces of the use of such material as is contained in the Fourth Gospel. The Epistles of Ignatius written in 110 A.D. show a close familiarity of ideas with those found in the Fourth Gospel. Study of the Gospel itself reveals the familiarity of the Writer with at least two of the Synoptics, Luke and Matthew. It must necessarily then be later than those gospels to have made use of them. Professor Bacon, then, concludes along with other scholars that this Gospel was written from 90-110 A.D. Moffatt extends the range a bit placing it from 90-115 A.D.[1]

---

[1] Moffatt, James, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, see Historical Tables, p. xxii.

III The Incarnation of the Divine Logos as a Development of Pauline Christology

Professor Bacon holds that there is great similarity between the writings of John and the writings of Paul, that the Elder does not differ from Paul but only develops what Paul has taught. He has suggested that the incarnation of the divine Logos is set forth in Paul's writings as it is in John's save only that Paul does not use the term "Logos" Professor Bacon moreover, maintains that the Fourth Gospel was written to refute the perverted form of Paul's teaching which had been spread abroad by Docetism. "But," he said, "he who looks in it for historical accuracy will be justly disappointed; for its aim is simply to interpret the career of the historic Jesus in the light of its own doctrine of the Incarnation as expressed in the prologue. The distortions are admittedly such as must naturally ensue when the Synoptic story, innocent of any notion of pre-existence, introducing Jesus' public career as a resumption of the interrupted work of the imprisoned prophet, and leading by degrees to the final recognition by the Twelve of a higher calling for their Master, is recast in the light of the doctrine of the atonement and the Pauline [illegible]."[1]

This development shall be discussed under separate topics.

---

[1] Hibbert Journal Vol. III p. 360

The first to be considered is:

Hellenistic Christology

In order to understand the Hellenistic Christology we have to consider the dispersion of the Hellenists and place the beginning of this development in its proper setting. Professor Bacon divides the Acts account of how the gospel was given to the Gentiles into three parts: Chapters 1-5, 12:1-24 and 9:32-11:8 giving Peter the credit; chapters 9:1-31 and 13-28 giving Paul the credit and chapters 6-8 giving the credit to unknown Hellenist refugees who fled from Jerusalem after the murder of Stephen. If he is justified in making these three divisions, and they appear quite evident in Acts since we find there both repetition and contradictions in accounts of the same events, then he is surely correct in concluding that the third mentioned tradition is to be preferred by any historian. The first two tend to glorify Peter and Paul. These refugees going into new communities turned many to the Christian way of life and thus opportunity was given for the rise of many unnamed Christian leaders.

"The incarnation doctrine of Paul cannot be deduced from Synoptic Christology, nor that of John from Paul alone. The doctrine goes back to the earliest years of the church, and at least in the case of John was formulated in opposition to

those who exploited the Baptist's prediction of the Great Successor in their own interest."[1]

The author of the Fourth Gospel wrote, as the church fathers and scholars since have seen, to refute Gnostic Hellenizers and of these the Samaritan school was the worst and most dangerous. Representatives of this school rose up afterthe fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple to proclaim:"Lo, here is Christ" or "Lo, there." Hence the pre-Galilean ministry, placing Jesus in Samaria before John was cast into prison was doubtless an effort,on the Evangelist's part, to show that John theBaptist was not, as the Baptizing sects claimed, their progenitor but that Jesus was. John the Baptist always maintained that his sole purpose was yo herald Jesus, the greater than he. One effective blow then, that the Evangelist could give these sects was that their so-called perpetuation of the work of John was a false redemption, since it was by water and not by blood. He made clear to them that none of their false prophets or Christs are the"greater One to come after" of whom John spoke.

Samaria had fallen directly into the main stream of Graeco-Jewish syncretism. It afforded a natural asylum for Hellenistic refugees, it was the first place of refuge for those who fled from Jerusalem after the stoning of Stephen.

---

1 Bacon, B.W. The Gospel of the Hellenists, p. 87
2 Ibid., p. 89 & 90.

It was likewise subjected to many other influences.This was the expereince of "Acute Hellenization" as Dr. Harnack puts it, through which the church of Samaria passed.

Samaria was the first seat of Hellenism in the Holy land and we are led to believe that the proper setting, at least the strongest influence in the development of Hellenistic Christology was in Samaria also. Justin Martyr who was a Greek, converted to Christianity in Ephesus about 135 A.D., said that in his time almost the entire population of Samaria "were devotees of Simon of Gitta, the Magian founder of the succession of false Christs described in Mark 13:6,21."[1]

In acts 8:23 we read of Peter's prediction concerning Simon of Magus,that he would become a"gall-root of bitterness and a bond of iniquity." Evidently the prediction came true; at any rate the outcome of Philip's mission to the capital even though supported by the Apostles at Jerusalem was not highly successful. Only in Caesarea did the gospel make a permanent place for itself and for Christianity and Luke credits Peter with the work at Caesarea, rather than Philip.

Proceeding on the assumption that Samaria was the earliest place of expansion for Hellenistic Christianity, the rallying-point of the Gnostic disciples of John, and a place that has since Jerome's time proudly exhibited to visitors the shrine

---

[1] Ibid., p. 82

of the martyred Baptist; Professor Bacon suggests that the reference John 4:35-38 may apply to the work of John the Baptist-- that the white fields into which he sendsthe disciples and whereon they have spent no labor, are the result of the Baptist's work.

The origin of the great difference in Christology which we find in the Synoptics and that which we find in the Fourth Gospel must be traced back to the beginnings ofthe faith which was common immediately after the resurrection. In this connection we cannot ignore the evidence of the early dispersiion of the Hellenists from Jerusalem and Paul's statement that during the first part of his missionary endeavors (first fourteen years) his contact with the churchesof Judea was slight.

In the Synoptic Gospels we havethe account of the exaltation of a man, Jesus, to Lordship in heaven from which place he shall shortly return as the "Son of Man" with heavenly glory to establish an everlasting Kingdom, promised to the"Son of David."

The Synoptics present Jesus as a thoroughly human being, a son of God who raises himself by his holy living and the mission which he fulfills , to theplace where he becomes The Son of God realizing a closer relationship to God and partaking of God's Spirit in a greater degree than any other man.

Quite to the contrary in both Paul's writings and the Fourth Gospel we find Jesus portrayed as a messenger from heaven sent to earth by God, his father. His time on earth is merely a brief incarnation after which he is to go back with the Father whose glory he has previously and always shared. It is true that in the Synoptic account his mission to earth is a matter ordained of God, which has been revealed to the prophets of Israel and is accompanied by miracles to prove his sonship but all this does not picture a conscious, pre-existent being coming from heaven to earth. About all that the two conceptions have in common is that Jesus is now "seated on the right hand of God" from whence he shall return to deliver his people; but again in the manner of that deliverance they differ as widely as they do in the incarnation-and apotheosis-Christologies.

The type of Christology found in the Fourth Gospel closely accords with the conceptions of prophets which had long been held in northern Syria, which conceived of the prophet as under the control of a divine spirit which had been sent from heaven to be the savior

of men. Such an one was the incarnation of a "pre-existent Being or Power." Of our gospels only the Fourth has this idea of pre-existence. Doubtless,then, it comes from the Hellenistic Soteriology blended with the influence ofthe Stoic Logos doctrine.

In the Pauline Epistles and somewhat in John we find a Christology based on the redeeming Wisdom of God, which Solomon prays may be sent forth from God's throne in heaven:

"And with thee is wisdom, which knoweth thy works,
And was present when thou wast making theworld,
And which understandeth what is pleasing in thine eyes,
And what is right according to thy commandments.
Send her forth out of the holy heavens,
And from the throne ofthy glory bid her come,
That being present with me she may toil with me,
And that I may learn what is well-pleasing before thee.
For she knoweth all things and hath understanding thereof,
And in my doings she shall guide me in ways of soberness,
and she shall guard me in her glory.
And so shall my works be acceptable,
And I shall judge thy people righteously,
And I shall be worthy of my father's throne.
For what man shall know the counsel of God?
Or who shall conceive what the Lord willeth?

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

And whoever gained knowledge of thy counsel,
except thou gavest wisdom,
And sentest thy holy spirit from on high?
And it was thus that the ways of them
which are on earth were corrected,
And men were taught the things that are
are pleasing unto thee;
And through wisdom were they saved."[1]

"Wisdom" in this book is caused to perform the same type of mission among men that the Logos incarnate in Christ performs according to theFourth Gospel. It guides men in right paths, it delivers man from his transgressions, and preserves "him blameless unto God."

---

[1] The Apocrypha, The Wisdom of Solomon 9:9-12, 17-18.

Naturally the Logos doctrine was congenial to our Author or he would not have attached the Prologue, yet we must admit that the Logos Christology of the Prologue and the Wisdom Christology of the rest of the Fourth Gospel are not in perfect accord. The Wisdom Christology is more purely a development of Paul's Christology and the Logos doctrine in its technical sense and with its association of speculative ideas is avoided in the major portion of the Gospel. We must think of it as a hymn prefixed to the Gospel which reveals in the form of poetry a meaning which prose finds more difficult to express.

To Paul the Wisdom which God had committed to Israel in the Law and the Prophets and which was able to save them was none other than the pre-incarnate spirit of Jesus or the Christ. With such an understanding, the eternal Christ whom Paul conceives to be the Son of God and the Savior of the world in the sense of a Redeemer from sin, he also sees as the Wisdom and the Word of God. But his conception of the Word is not the mystical Logos in the Greek metaphysical sense, but the word of divine Wisdom by which man is redeemed---the preached word of

the Gospel. Though Paul's conception of the"Word"is not the same as the Hellenistic"Logos," one can see how the Hellenist would develop Paul's teaching concerning the Word of Wisdom which is able to save the soul into the incarnation of the Logos. This is not altogether foreign to the thought of the Jew who also believed, as the Wisdom of Solomon illustrates, that God was on the earth, particularly in the form of Wisdom. The Wisdom Christology of Paul shows God incarnate in man through the "Indwelling Christ." The conception of Wisdom as divinity entering into the lives of men, was however, for the Jew, a prayer, yet to be answered, a hope, yet to be realized in New Testament times. Enoch had taught that the Messiah must come before the "fountains of Wisdom" would be opened to all those who thirsted for the righteousness of God. Quite natural it is then, that Paul and the Evangelist who wrote this Gospel of the Hellenists, convinced that Jesus was the fulfillment of these hopes, should make use of these conceptions.

The Fourth Gospel endeavors to show the perfection of incarnation in Jesus by showing how the Gnosis (knowledge of God) which had been partially revealed in the Law and the Prophets was fully revealed in the "Son of Man"whose words and actions were under the divine control of God. As the Elder wrestles with the problem of how to unite into one

single personlity the human Jesus of the Petrine tradition and the abstract Divine Wisdom. But out of this attempted reconciliation there comes his most "cherished religious conception." It is according to Professor Bacon :"Jesus as heavenly messenger and representative oftheworld of light, who is sent forth by the Fatherin the fulness of time in human form for the redemption of a sinful world."[1] Therefore in him men might find the Light which gave Eternal Life. The conception is like that of Paul in Gal.4:4-6. The incarnation comes by the Father sending theSpirit, not by a miraculous birth. Other examples follow ofthe way in which Paul's teaching or the teaching of his disciples (if Ephesians be deutero-Pauline) is developed in the Fourth Gospel.

Professor Bacon maintains that the passage in Ephesians 2:15 which teaches thatlifein Christ is so above the law that it abolishes the need for the law, is the inspiration of the passage in John 1:35 - 2:11 which shows that the gift of the Spirit supersedes the law. He also holds that the teaching of the scene at Jacobs well in Samaria is inspired by Ephesians 2:17-22 where "through him (Christ)we both (Jew andGentile) have our access in one spirit unto the Father."

Many such close comparisons may be made. One of the most interesting is that of thePauline Hymn (Phil.2:6-11) with the Johannine Hymn (Jn. 1:1-12)[2]

---

1 Bacon, B. W., The Gospel of the Hellenists, p. 177 [illegible]

2 An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 251, ftnt.1. Ibid., p. 313

We have said beforethatthe Fourth Gospel was written to combat heresy. If we say that it was written "to refute the error of Cerinthus" we let the name Cerinthus stand for a combination of the syncretistic Jewish Gnosticism, with special emphasis on the baptizing sects, whose proaganda came forth from Samaria and North Syria. The mere interpretation of the Petrine tradition could not at all adequately meet the needs of the Hellenistic churches. The story of Jesus' ministry, suffering and resurrection was basic to their faith but it had to be rewritten in the light of a higher meaning which would include a new birth in the Spirit.

It is unfortunate for the field of Biblical interpretation that Professor Bacon felt forced to spend so much ofhis time and scholarship seeking to prove the correct authorship of the Fourth Gospel when he has such a rich contribution to make to theinterpretation of its content. He clarifies the message by interpreting it in the light of the times in which it was written, a treatment which is justly due any document. Measuring it by contemporary documents, aids the student in understanding the meaning of this Gospel for its own day and for ours.

Present day Hellenists, as it were, find a deeper meaning and a saner teaching in such an interpretation of the Fourth Gospel as is here presented. On this particular

point Professor Bacon said,

> The situation of the Church today calls imperatively for a modernized interpretation of the great doctrines we have referred to. The apostolic message summarized by Paul in the words,"How that God, in the person of Christ, was reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing to men their trespasses," cannot be conveyed to men of the twentieth century, accustomed to think in terms of world religions, in the essentially Jewish forms of Synoptic story. To think of God as operative in the person of Christ, we require more than an apotheosis doctrine, even when it is supplemented by a doctrine of miraculous birth. The modern man is ready to believe that the human qualities of faith, love, devotion, seen at their highest in Jesus are not of the earth earthy. But to appreciate that the eternal nature of God, ever making for righteousness, ever working for man's redemption, is here revealed incarnate, there must be a deeper foundation than the portrait drawn from the reminiscences of Peter, however glorified by visions of the Son of Man. The modern Christian has long since founded his faith, and will continue to found it, on the eternal, indwelling Christ of Paul. On such a doctrine of divine incarnation the church of post-apostolic days laid hold. Little by little it assimilated and adapted to its use the Logos doctrine which our Ephesian Evangelist had previously seized upon from amid the welter of syncretistic religions of redemption round about him. . . . . Something corresponding to the Logos doctrine of Jn is indeed indispensable to the maintenance of the historic faith in the rational atmosphere of today.[1]

In one respect the Christology of John falls behind that of Paul for he still clings to the "signs and wonders" which held such a strong appeal for a great many contemporaries. He holds however that it is true that faith which believes on the simple word unaided by a miracle is higher than which depends on a"sign."

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 307-308

A detailed comparison with the Synoptics will show that when the Evangelist does employ these signs itis to teach a lesson. He manipulates them to suit his messages as ministers employ the parables today.

Because the Evangelist pronounces a blessing upon them who "have not seen and yet have believed," (20:29)indicates that he claims no first hand contact with Jesus in the flesh. He commends the ability of the church to base its report on aythentic tradition of eye-and-ear-witnesses to the life of Jesus but he depends upon the corporate tradition.

Hellenistic Christology, thebeginnings of which emanated from Samaria and North Syria has its final development in Asia by blending the Pauline Wisdom doctrine with the Johannine Logos doctrine.

We consider next:

The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptists

Faced with the question why isthe Fourth Gospel different from the Synoptics, we turn to theproblem of its motivation. Why was this Gospel written? The answers from antiquity we find in two passages from Eusebius, first:"They say that John, who had employed all his time in preaching the gospel orally, finally proceeded to write for the following reason. The three gospels already mentioned(Mt, Mk, Lk) having come into the handsof all, and into his own too, they say that he

accepted them and bore witness to their truthfulness; but that there was lacking in them an account of the deeds done by Christ atthe beginning of his ministry."[1] This passage is a part of the summary of the argument of Proclus which he argued against Gaius of Rome when they were disputing over the admission of the Fourth Gospel to the canon. Gaius said that to admit John to thecanon would set "the Gospels at variance with one another." Proclus answered as the quotation above indicates that John was written not to question the truth of the Synoptics but to supplement their record. Chapters 1-4 were then the portions of controversy, those chapters which give such a different pictureof his early ministry from the Synoptics--placing the cleansing of the Temple,for example, and the announcement of his Messiah-ship at the beginning.

The other passage from Eusebius, taken from Clement of Alexandria shows a deeper insight into the real difference between John and the Synoptics. After commenting on the origin of other three Gospels, he said, "Last of all John also, perceiving that the external facts had been made plain in the Gospel, being urged by his friends (an inference from John 21:24) and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel." This statement tells three things:(1) that John was the latest

---

1 History of Ecclesia, III, 24:7, See the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. I Eusebius, Chruch History, pp.153, 261

2 Ibid., VI, 14,7

gospel of the four, (2) that it is not a biography, and (3) that it is to be taken as a spiritual Gospel--one intended to convey a definite religious teaching and message, not merely to record a series of historical facts. This Gospel presents the life story of the spirit of Christ rather than a life story of the deeds done in the flesh. It displays the inner significance of the Christian revelation.

The conception of the Fourth Gospel as a supplement to the Synoptics does not do justice to the Gospel. As Professor Bacon clearly states, this gospel is not a "Midrashic commentary on tradition." It is unique and makes its own contribution in interpreting the Christian story and Christian experience to a Hellenistic world in terms of Greek thought. In this it not merely interpreted the Synoptic tradition Hellenistically but it met a real need. It presented a Savior-Spirit which appealed to their highest conception of the nature of a Savior. The idea of a savior was not new to them--only the type of Savior was different. The Fourth Gospel contains material from a great many sources. It is a composition of Johannine reminiscences, Hellenistic mysticism and theosophy, Greek philosophic thought and the ancient Logos hymn. All of this material is made to serve the one purpose of the Fourth Gospel, that of glorifying Christ.

The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, showing Jesus' relation to God takes the place of the voice from heaven at the baptism of Jesus in the Synoptics. In the Fourth Gospel the voice at the Baptism is made a witness neither to the people who stood by nor to Jesus but to John, that this was he for whom he was to prepare the way.

The Evangelist makes Jerusalem and Judea the chief scenes of Jesus' public ministry and divides that southern Palestinian territory between Jesus and John the Baptist, placing John the Baptist where he finds his followers about 100 A.D. in Transjordania and central Samaria. Samaria was a seat of much heresy and as both Irenaeus and the Epistles indicate the Fourth Gospel was written to refute heresy. Yet the correction of heresies, particularly related to the Baptist was not the chief object of our writer. He is interested in doctrine and often seems closer to the Gnostics than to the more primitive Synoptic doctrine, for, like Paul, he agrees with the Gnostics in making incarnation instead of deification, the real watchword of the gospel. He takes from the Petrine tradition the designation "Son of Man" but he uses it in a different sense from the Synoptics.

He attaches no apologetic meaning to it. He looks upon Jesus not as the last great prophet of God who was sent to warn Jerusalem of her fate but the last of the saviors sent from heaven to earth." Hence the Evangelist can adopt and use as his own, a Hymn to the Logos, whose prior use must be sought in circles nearer to Samaria than to Galilee. In fact our closest parallel to the Christological use of this designation is found in the Syrian, anti-Gnostic Preaching of Peter (120-150 A.D.). Here the constant designation of the Lord, was, as Clement informs us "Word and Law" (λόγος καὶ νόμος). But this doctrine is not derived from Paul, else it would show the marks of its Pauline origin. Paul and John alike draw upon a Hellenistic interpretation of the gospel probably of Syrian origin."[1]

Criticism has taken the props one after another from under the harmonists and the theory of John as a supplement has been thoroughly undermined.

Professor Bacon said that no one had made a more thorough and exhaustive treatment of the peculiar combination of dependence upon and disregard for the Synoptics on the part of the Fourth Gospel than had H. Windisch in his volume Johannes und die Synoptiker. From this study

---

[1] Bacon, B.W. The Gospel of the Hellenists, p. 73

Windisch concludes that John certainly used Mark; it is highly probable that he used Luke and not improbable that he used Matthew; though Matthew and John arethe least congenial; theonly real instance of verbal agreement between them being John 12:8 and Matthew 26:11 and John 12:8 is not found in the oldest witness to the text, the Sinaitic Syriac and is, hence, probably a gloss.

Professor Bacon uses this to substantiate his view that John, the Evangelist,was acquainted,in all probability,with the three gospels.

It is true that even as early as Mark a method was used by which groups of anecdotes were combined to produce a drama as in Mk 1:1-13 and 9:2-13 but in John everything must be confirmed to the idea of theincarnation of the messenger from heaven and sometimes we feel as though we have more drama than life. His "signs" or miracles by which he causes Jesus to prove his divine sonship and the five great festal discourses are very different from the Synoptic accounts.

The treatment of Peter is another outstanding instance of the difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. The Evangelist almost without exception presents Peter in an unfavorable light while the Synoptics make him leader and spokesman for the Twelve.[1]

---

[1] See Jno. 1:35-42; 6:68-71; 13:6-10, 36-38; 18:25-27; 18:15f; 20:1-10; 21:1-7.

He also ignores the position of James which the Synoptics admit.

Literary Criticism

Professor Bacon acknowledges the strong arguments set forth by Schlatter, Burney and Torrey for Semitic coloration in John. That this coloring exists there, is undeniable. Torrey and Burney go further and support the thesis that John's Gospel is a translation from the Aramaic. But leading philological authorities such as G.R. Driver, O.T. Allis and W.H. Howard have presented adverse criticism to such a theory of translation.

Professor Bacon welcomes the conclusion that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a Palestinian who was thinking in his native Aramaic; for this supports his endeavor to connect the religious ideas of the Fourth Gospel with those of the syncretistic Jewish Gnosticism of northern Syria, especially Samaria. But he does not agree with Torrey's thesis that if we could produce the "original Aramaic" there would be little or no more occasion for higher criticism. He shows that the Johannine problem is too complicated to depend upon a translation from the original alone for a final solution. This problem has so many aspects that one is amazed that a man of Torrey's scholarship and judgment would make such an extravagant statement. If such a translation were possible it should be regarded as only one instrument from a number to be used in interpreting this work.

The history of ideas depends upon more than their transmission through written forms in any dialect. Their formation and co-ordination make necessary a "study of structure, purpose and parallels."[1]

When we examine the structure of the Gospel and the materials used we discover that the number of incongruities as to the change of time and place as well as the positions of the subject matter are numerous: e.g.in 18:24 Annas sends Jesus to Caiaphas, the high priest, when in the preceding verses he has appeared before the High priest in his palace and has been questioned by him.

In 6:6 Jesus goes "across the sea of Galilee" which would be natural if he were on eithersideof the sea (cf.6:17) but in the section just preceding, he is in Jerusalem. Some remove this last mentioned difficulty by placing chapter 6 before chapter 5 which arrangement may be substantiated by the context.

Again in 14:31 the words, "Arise let us go hence," clearly ought to close the Farewell Discourse; yet the discourse continues for two entire chapters. Another instance like this which stands out is found in 20:30f in which the writer clearly brings his book to a close: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye may believe that

---

[1] See Bacon, B.W., Gospel of the Hellenists, pp 120-124

Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." This closing pharagraph in chapter 20 indicates that chapter 21 is either an afterthought or was added by a later hand.

Professor Bacon maintains along with Streeter, MacGregor, Moffatt and others, that these confusions and inconsistencies have come as incidental results of the revision of a later hand than that of the original author. Professor Bacon suggests that this Redactor was the author of the appendix which was added toward the middle of the second century.[1] Proceeding on such an assumption he argues that passages whose thought runs counter to that of the Evangelist must be additions from the hand of the Redactor. Ruling out the theory of accidental misplacement as improbable, and mistranslation of an original Aramaic as inadequate, he suggests further that the reason for including John 15-16 which for the most part is a re-echo of the ideas expressed in John 13-14, is that the Redactor found a first draft, among the literary remains of John, which he admired so much that he inserted it also after the close of the discourse taken from the second draft.

If this hypothesis is accepted it adds to the Redactors transpositions, summaries, and additions, a new group of verses, viz., materials which he possessed of the original author's literary remains.

---

1 Ibid., p. 136

It is not always possible to determine in which group a passage belongs. The more important function of such an analysis, however, is that it presents a new and more reasonable conception of the process through which the Gospel passed in reaching its present form. This process becomes quite evident. Professor Bacon has divided it into three steps.

Unusually great significance which the Evangelist attaches to the festal visits to Jerusalem and to the "signs and wonders," makes the first step a composition of a series of discourses appropriate to the feasts of the Jewish year. These discourses are introduced with an appropriate sign:

The discourse on The Son As the Giver of Life was introduced by the sign--healing of the man at the pool of Bethesda.

The discourse on The Bread of Life was introduced by the Feeding of theFive Thousand.

The discourse on The Light of the World is coupled with the restoring of sight to the blind man.

Jesus the Mediator of Life is coupled with the sign of the raising of the dead.[1]

All of this shows a very artificial set up for the frame work of this gospel. Such as one making a study of a situation upon which he could look back, would use as a literary device. Not only does the element of retrospect indicate a late date but the prominence given to the feasts suggest an outsider.

---

1 Ibid., p260ff.

For one used to keeping the feasts all his life would refer to them more casually and as a matter of course, never making of them a frame work for his Gospel.

The second step or stage in the process of the growth of the Gospel was the expanding of these discourses into a narrative of Jesus' life. This transition was not easy to make and though the Synoptic tradition has been employed, the discourses still far outweigh the biography. The elder of Ephesus was doubtless the author of these discourses , the same elder as wrote II and III John. Whatever of true biography is there,may have come from an eye-and-ear-witness aside from the Synoptic tradition or it may have been taken from the other three gospels. But the third step in the process introduces another--the Redactor.

I quote Professor Bacon at this point:

> Profoundly impressed by the religious value of the document, the Redactor may have been able to trace its origin to Ephesus and to the time when Revelation was written. So he may have reached the mistaken notion of its apostolic authorship. In Ephesus may also have come into possession of other literary remains of the Elder, perhaps even of the original collection of didactic discourses. With such material in his possession he may well have seen the biographical narrative in a new light, as an effort at adaptation, and hence felt free to take a hand in the work. Impressed with the importance of Synoptic traditions for biograph ical purposes, and convinced that the deviation from this standard which he found in Jn was due to the natureof the material adapted, he made it his chief concern to accommodate Jn to the Synoptic pattern.[1]

According to Professor Bacon the Elder attaches the prologue but the Redactor is author of the appendix. For a detailed analysis of Professor Bacon's arrangement of the Fourth Gospel, see his translation.[2]

---

1 Ibid., pp 139-40
2 Ibid., pp 243-302

IV Conclusion

Contributions Peculiar to Bacon

Authorship

1. Papias Argument from silence

Some scholars such as Sanday and Lightfoot place considerable confidence in the influences of echoes from Papias which they believe reflect a knowledge of the Fourth Gospel. This evidence if proved, however, does not support the theory of Apostolic authorship but rather confirms the opposite by its silence--in refraining to use it when Papias deals in his preface with the reliability of apostolic sources for the tradition of the early Church and its teaching.[1] Professor Bacon quotes Eusebius in showing what made the elders so important to Papias: that they could report "what Andrew or what Peter said, or what was said by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James or by John (the seer of the Patmos vision), or by Matthew (the compiler of the Oracles), or by any other of the disciplesof the Lord." Hence in treating of the tradition of John the Apostle as author of the Gospel, Professor Bacon adds to the list of the arguments from silence that of Papias also.

2. A Gospel of the Hellenists

The Evangelist found himself, a Hellenist living among Hellenists to whom he must present Jesus as a Christ who was

---

1. Bacon, B. W., The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, p.

a very different figure from the Synoptic picture; for his community of believers differed in their beliefs from those expressed in the Synoptics as philosophy differs from history and "he aimed fundamentally to write their gospel, the Gospel of the Hellenists."[1]

If I understand Professor Bacon, he believed that the Fourth Gospel was written neither to supplement nor to supplant the Synoptics. He seems to accept Clement of Alexandria's statement that the Synoptics supplied the external facts and that the Evangelist realized this but that he undertook to supply the inner significance of the Spirit and teaching of Jesus. This Gospel contains perhaps the most beautiful example in all history of the spiritual portraiture of Jesus.

3. From the same hand as the Epistles

One of the "fatal objections" as Professor Bacon styles it, which the defenders of the traditional view meet is that the subject matter of this gospel is not more historical than the Synoptics, but more legendary. This is contrary to that which one would expect from a disciple who knew Jesus in the flesh.[2]

The four writings (the Gospel and three Epistles) which Professor Bacon has called the X literature are, he

---

[1] Bacon, B.W., The Gospel of the Hellenists, p 119

[2] Ibid., p 116

maintains from the same hand. He says that the few "infinitesimal differences in style and doctrine pointed to by a few ultra-critical scholars are explicable from the fact that the Gospel has been revised at least once." One cannot but pause to comment how Professor Bacon with his vociferous use of language easily passes over an argument made against his thesis; while to substantiate his thesis he uses one just as weak or weaker. As an example--he said that the indirect internal evidence of the Fourth Gospel outweighs with most critics even its authors inference that it is Palestinian. With that he assumes that the inference has been treated sufficiently.

4. Final identity of the Author

Jerusalem tradition blended the character of John, the son of Zebedee with the character of another and younger John of Jerusalem. Evidence ofthis blending comes in the second century between the martyrdom of John, the son of Zebedee (62-63 A.D.) and the end of the century. This younger John moved in well-to-do and priestly circles, became a companion of Peter. His house was known as the house of Mary, for that was his mother's name. It is easily explained then, how this younger John with such associations came to be confused with John, the Apostle.

"That this is no mere imaginative theory but represents the actual process of blending and transformation to which

the tradition of "John"was subjected in Jerusalem after the return of the church from Pella, can be shown by reference to Zahn. In his Geschichte des ntl. Kanons Zahn, "the prince of conservative scholars," has pointed out that "confusions of John Mark with the Apostle John, and of Mary who was the mother of Mark with Mary the mother of Jesus, who may be called the adoptive mother of Mark," were already current beforethe time of the Muratorianum.[1]

We have then three personalities represented in the authorship ofthe Gospel: the witness, who is this blended personality of the two Johns of Jerusalem; the Evangelist who wrote the major part of the Gospel as we know it, and who was the Ephesian Elder John, perhaps a Palestinian Jew by birth, at any rate one who knew the country; and the Redactor who added such portions as Professor Bacon has italicized in his translation.[2] These sections include all of the appendix and many other verses. The Redactor may have lived in Ephesus or he may have compiled the Gospel in Rome.

Development of Pauline Christology

Paul expressly states the very teaching which leads to the doctrine of the incarnation of the divine Logos in the Fourth Gospel: "I live,yet not I but Christ liveth in me."

And, quite contrary to being bound by Jewish particularism,

---

1 Ibid., quoting Zahn, Vol.II, 1890, p. 19. See also his INT, translated by Jacobus, Vol. II, 1909, pp. 446-447.

2 [illegible]

Paul says in his letter to the Galatians: "Walk by the Spirit, - - - - - - For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision but a new creature."

In the passage, IICor. 4:3-6, is found almost the same teaching of Jesus as the Light of the World which the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel contains, except that Paul makes God to send the Light as shining through Jesus, which is not as complete an incarnation as is found in the Fourth Gospel.

Other instances of the basic Christology in Paul which is developed in the Fourth Gospel have been stated in Division III of this thesis as have also the reasons for believing the book to be a Gospel of the Hellenists and hence presenting a Hellenistic Christology.

Other Contributions

In order to show how rich Professor Bacon's late book, The Gospel of the Hellenists, is in interpretation I shall just state briefly three other contributions, which do not deal with the major divisions of this thesis but do deal with his interpretation of this Gospel:

1. The Son of Man conception with its changed idea of the second coming is presented in John 14:22-23 e.g. where Judas is taught that the Son of Man is not to come as a spectacular appearance to the world but as an innward knowledge to those who love Christ. "In Johannine theology, therefore,

the Son of Man is not the judge who comes "with the clouds of heaven" surrounded by hosts of angels, but the deliverer who opens the gates of heaven for ascending prayers of men as well as for descending heavenly powers. He has already descended to earth bringing an inward self-judgment of men by his light which shines across their darkness, but he must be"lifted up" again whencehe came to"fill all things" with powers of the age to come."[1]

2. Salvation , in the Fourth Gospel is individual. In the Synoptics there are many passages to support a social gospel but in this Gospel there must be a new birth, not by flesh nor the will of man but by the will of God; not Seek ye first the Kingdom and all else will be added but Ye shall not see the Kingdom unless ye have first beenborn again of water and the Spirit.

3. Professor Bacon suggests John theBaptist as the laborer whose harvest the disciples were sent to reap in John 4:35-38.

Other Scholar's opinions of Bacon's Contributions

Considerable comment has been made of The Fourth Gospel In Research and Debate. Concerning this volume W.F. Howard said that it was the weightiest contribution which has been made to the problem, that it is brilliant but "intensely and even scornfully polemical."[2] Regarding similar treatment in his

---

1 Ibid., p. 322

2 Howard, W.F., The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, p.

articles in the Hibbert Journal on the Johannine Problem, Professor Sanday said that they are "highly original, very incisive, and exceedinly clever." His objection to them is that they are too clever. He infers that Professor Bacon acquired his clever method of criticism from his study in Germany and that he learned his lesson too well. A specific objection to his arguments that Professor Sanday makes is: he puts aside too easily the broad simple arguments such as Irenaeus, Polycrates, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria etc. have held and "spends his strength in making bricks with a minimum of straw and even with no straw at all (the argumrnt from silence)."[1]

Referring to the question of the relation of I Jn to the Fourth Gospel (whether ornot they were written by the same author) Professor Sanday again shows his attitude toward Professor Bacon by saying in a footnote: "H.J. Holtzmann, Schmiedel and Professor Bacon are on the one side; Julicher, Wrede and Wernle are on the other; and in each of these instances the opinion is thoroughly characteristic; the subtle and acute minds are ranged against those that are stronger on the side of what we should call plain common sense."[2]

Professor Drummond who calls Bacon a controversialist,

---

1 Sanday, Wm. Criticism ofthe Fourth Gospel, pp 24-25

2 Ibid., p. 75

accuses him of exhibiting a personal antagonism in his comments on other authors, and cites his own experience with him. Yet perhaps Drummond gives the kindliest criticism which an opponent could give him when he says: "I have no doubt that Professor Bacon thinks that his representation is correct and puts it forward in what he conceives to be the service of truth; but I think nevertheless that his judgment has been warped by his zeal in the cause which he advocates." This he said in defending himself against remarks by Bacon which referred to his judgments being so antiquated and partial as to render them worthless.

Professor Drummond reveals a fault of Bacon's—that of taking a few more or less incidental references, exploding the weightof their evidence and then condemning or undermining the entire thesis on the basis of such slender discrepancies as e.g. in the case of Baur's theory as used by Drummond.[2] Drummond says of Bacon that he "would do well to study with more accuracy when he quotes and to read the context."

Professor Bacon becomes very harsh, almost contemptuous in his references to these two scholars, Sanday and Drummond relative to the defence of the Fourth Gospel when he says that he

---

1 Hibbert Journal, Vol. IX, No. 1, p. 192

2 Ibid., p. 194

intends to defend the Fourth Gospel: (1) Against the sacrifice of its veracity to ecclesiastical tradition; and (2) Offers an appreciation of its value as a record ofthebeginning of Christianity.

It is only fair to both scholars however to state also that they had more pleasant contacts and found themselves ultimately nearer agreement as is eveidenced in Professor Bacon's article from the 1932 edition of the American Journal of Theology . Here Professor Bacon records that Professor Sanday said to him once as he handed him a syllabus of lectures which he was to deliver on the Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, which was afterward published in book form (1905):"I am afraid I must break a lance with you in New York." But Professor Bacon remarks in this late account:"How could one feel anything but reverence and affection for an opponent so invariably courteous and truth-loving, so learned, yet afraid only of making statements not fully borne out by the evidence." Then in 1920, he handed Professor Bacon a copy of his lectures of 1919 which had"brought consternation to the ranks of the 'Modernists'" and which were published under the title:Divine Overruling, a term which Professor Bacon came to use more and more relative to his own life. This time he pointed to a passage which gave quite a different message to Professor Bacon from his earlier remark. It read:"I am afraid there is one point on which I was probably wrong--the Fourth Gospel."

All this has arisen in connection with the first great contribution, The Authorship, now we turn to the second major con-

tribution which we are considering — The Hellenistic Christology of the Johannine writings as a straightforward development from the Pauline Christology. Other scholars have appraoached the problem buthave not carried it as far as has Professor Bacon.

Professor Streeter in his bookThe Primitive Church, holds also that unnamed Jews who were converted in Jerusalem and fled to escape martydom like Stephen's or Jews of the dispersion who had visited Jerusalem and had become Christians carried the gospel message to Antioch and other places. He holds also that church organization varied to fitthe needs of the community. Does this not lend support to the theory that the Gospel would also be taught in a way that would meet the peculiar needs of the community. Thus we get a Gospel of theHellenists.

Professor E.F. Scott whose book The Fourth Gospel was published[1] at about the same time in which Professor Bacon was writing his periodicals on the Johannine Problem, said: Paul indeed had apprehended with a sure religious instinct, that therewas neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free, but all were one in Christ Jesus. As a Jewish thinker, however, he could discover no adequate form wherein to express this conviction of the universality of the Gospel. He still moved within the circle of the traditional Messianic ideas, wrapt up as they were with the expectation of a purely national deliverer. With the adoption of the Logos doctrine, Christianity was finally severed from the bonds of Jewish particularism. Jesus was now

---

1 Published in 1907

the word that had been from the beginning, the Light that lighteth every man. The name of Messiah ceased to bear its historical meaning, and became nothing but an alternative for the truer and more comprehensive title of "Son of God" . . . . . "With the aid of his Logos hypothesis, John was able to assign to Jesus His central place as not only founder, but in His own person the object, of Christianity. To know Him, and believe in Him, and apprehend Him through an inward fellowship, constituted the real aim of the Christian life."[1]

It is clear from this that at that time Professor Scott did not recognize the "indwelling Christ" of the Pauline doctrine as one whom the early Christians apprehended "through an inward fellowship." In fact he stated that the universal character of the work of Christ was plainly asserted for the first time by identification of Him with the Logos.[2]

It was left for a scholar such as Professor Bacon to so reason, and discover that Paul also who was "the great missionary to the Gentiles" and who had the ability of becoming "all things to all men" must necessarily have reasoned with them in a way which made the Christian message clear and appealing to them.

---

1 Scott, E.F The Fourth Gospel, pp. 268 - 370

2 Ibid., p. 368

My Own Conclusions

It cannot be said of Professor Bacon (to use one of his descriptive sentences) that "the native hue of resolution was sicklied o'er with thepale cast of thought."There is an enthusiasm about his writings and a firm resolve to prove his thesis which almost becomes dogmatic. I shall speak of several weaknesses or what seem to me weaknesses in his scholarship.

His ideas are often more novel and interesting than they are possible. He does not have historical evidence enough to support his hypothesis. For example, the conjecture that Philip's daughter wrote the book of Revelation is interesting and certainly it is novel that the writing of any woman should have been canonized at that early date. However, it is not at all likely and there is no substantial evidence.

He has a tendency to condemn and easily put aside the evidence of other scholars if it differs from his own. Furthermore he employs ridicule in doing this, which is not courteous, neither is it scholarly. As an example of this I refer to his treatment of James Drummond in the Hibbert Journal, earlier menticned in this thesis.

He frequently proceeds on the basis of an assumption to prove a truth. This is not a genuine proof even if the assumption is quite conceiveable and often his are very precarious; e.g. his reading John's martyrdom into the narrative of Hegesippus.

Professor Bacon knew his subjects so well that he left too much to be supplied and to the immature student his treatments sometimes seem incomplete and contradictory because the details have not been thoroughly cared for. It is clear that matters of which the student knows nothing, he took for granted were common knowledge. To make clear this fault of which I speak, let me contrast Professor E. F. Scott's work, for he so clarifies his statements that even an undergraduate would not be left wondering what he meant.

The last and one of the severest criticisms of Professor Bacon which I should make on the adverse side is his very poor literary style of long and involved sentences in which it is sometimes difficult to find the subject or the verb for which the subject calls.

One can explain the tendency in his work which appears dogmatic after one realizes the situation which he encountered at Yale. Had he been less confident in his judgments, perhaps he would not have successfully established the use of the methods and results of higher criticism. Certainly he has advanced Biblical study through his stimulation to thought. When his novel ideas have come forth, other scholars have looked again and more deeply into the problems of Biblical criticism and thus advancement has been achieved.

Relative to his two major contributions which I have

been discussing in this thesis I should say:

No one can prove conclusively who was the author of the Fourth Gospel. There must be of necessity some assumption and an element of conjecture if one attempts to do so. Professor Bacon has come to a strong, sane, feasible conclusion in saying that the Gospel was written by an Elder in Ephesus who knew considerable about Palestine and the teachings of Paul as well as Hellenistic philosophies; and edited later by a Redactor who made certain additions. No scholar can deny that the evidence, particularly the internal evidence supports this conclusion.

I am persuaded, however, that his greatest contribution is the second; for, if, indeed, the Fourth Gospel grew out of Paul's conception and is a natural development, not only does it explain the evangelism of early Christianity, accounting for its spread and preservation but it gives meaning for today.

If we can believe that Paul, who was among the first to spread the teachings of Jesus, taught an indwelling Christ who perfectly exhibited this Light which was God, then we have much more assurance that we do right in teaching and preaching an inner experience of the Christ-life which we today call high spiritual living than we can get from the Synoptics which tend to make Jesus a victim of the thought of his day. Of course the fact that Paul was nearer to Jesus' life from point of time does not prove that he interpreted him more

correctly than did the Synoptist but it tends to make such teaching more genuinely Christian than if we believed that the incarnation of the divine Logos in human life was not a part of Christian teaching or experience until the time of the Fourth Gospel which was so late that we would be inclined to call it merely a syncretism of Hellenistic thought.

Professor Bacon referred to this nameless Elder as "the greatest of the inspired writers" and I should say that both in him and in Professor Bacon, who gave so much of his life energy to free this Elder that he might speak to man without the "mask" of the apostle, was the Light which is the Life of man.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Bacon's Articles from the Hibbert Journal

The Johannine Problem, External Evidence, Vol. I, pp. 510 ff., April 1903

_____ Direct Internal Evidence, Vol. II pp. 323 ff., Jan. 1904

_____ Indirect Internal Evidence, Vol. III, pp. 353 ff., Jan.1905

Gospel Types in Primitive Tradition, Vol. IV p. 877 ff., July, 1906

The"Defence"of the Fourth Gospel, Vol. VI pp 118 ff., Oct. 1907

Drummond, James,Reviews:"The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate" Vol. IX pp 191 ff., Oct. 1910

Books

The Apocrypha, (The Wisdom of Solomon), New York, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1894.

Bacon, Bemjamin W., The Fourth Gospel in Reasearch and Debate, New York, Moffat, Yard and Company, 1910.

_____, The Gospel of the Hellenists, edited by C.H. Kraeling, New York, Henry Holt & Co. 1933.

_____, An Introduction to the New Testament, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1900.

_____, The Making of theNew Testament, 1912.

Eusebius, Church History, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second series, Vol. I

Ferm, Vergilius, Contemporary American Theology, Vol. I, New York, Round Table Press Inc., 1932.

Howard, W. F., The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, London, The Epworth Press, 1931.

[illegible], Harper and Brothers, 1897.

Moffatt, James, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929 (reprint).

Scott, E. F., The Fourth Gospel, Edinburgh, T.& T.Clark 1906.

Streeter, B. H., The Four Gospels, New York, Macmillan Co., 1925.

_____, The Primitive Church, New York, Macmilla n Co., 1929.

The Holy Bible, American Standard Version

End of

A critical evaluation of the contributions of Professor Benjamin W. Bacon to the interpretation of the fourth gospel

This title was preceded by

The Jesus of history reinterpreted for today

And is continued by

Predestination and incarnation

The social and religious origins of the Negro Church

The contribution of the new physics to religious thought

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1935 call number Thesis Cage 1935 v.4